

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 were pending. Claims 1-4, 10, 13-20, 22, 29, and 31 have been amended. Claims 39-46 have been added. Claims 1, 13, 22, 31, and 40 are independent. Reconsideration of the action mailed December 8, 2003, is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. No new matter is added.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 13-17, 19-24, 27-31, and 33-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,314,423 B1 (“Himmel”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,496,829 (“Nakamura”). The Examiner rejected claims 4, 12, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel in view of Nakamura and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,175,842 B1 (“Kirk”). The Examiner rejected claims 6, 18, 26, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Himmel in view of Nakamura, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,269,403 B1 (“Anders”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Section 103(a) rejections

Claim 1 was rejected as unpatentable over Himmel in view of Nakamura. As amended, claim 1 recites “each destination having an associated bookmark media object located in the external network environment, the associated bookmark media object when presented to a user providing information regarding a state of the destination.” Neither Himmel nor Nakamura disclose or suggest a bookmark media object located in the external network environment and that provides information regarding a state of the destination.

In Himmel, a searchable bookmark repository including bookmark sets is disclosed. A bookmark set includes a URL for each bookmark and keywords that make the bookmark searchable. *See*, col. 2, lines 62-63. A client can search for a set of bookmarks associated with a particular keyword and then download the set of bookmarks to a client computer. The bookmarks can then be used by the client browser to access the set of URLs. *See*, col. 3, lines 8-11. The bookmarks disclosed by Himmel are “comprised of a URL to a web page and an associated descriptive text string.” *See* col. 5, lines 27-31. The text string is a static description of the web page. The text string is used to facilitate recognition of the web page by the user and can be entered when the bookmark set is created. *Id.*

The bookmarks in Himmel do not provide information regarding a state of a destination. A URL reference does not provide state information. In contrast, the claimed bookmark media objects provide information regarding a state of the destination. For example, a bookmark media object can be a thumbnail of a destination that provides a representation of a state of the destination. The bookmarks in Himmel are also located external to the destination environment. A destination environment is an environment (*e.g.*, a web site, a chat room) that can include a number of destinations (*e.g.*, individual web pages on the web site, chat locations within the chat room). *See* page 3, lines 27-30. The bookmarks disclosed by Himmel are located in a server or on a client device that is external from the destination environment. In contrast, the claimed bookmark media objects are located in the destination environment.

The Examiner contends that Nakamura discloses Applicant's bookmark media objects at col. 15, lines 35-37. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 15, lines 35-37 only describe various forms of storage media such as a CD-ROM and flash memory. In Nakamura, a system for managing a list of bookmarks is described. Nakamura describes bookmarks as URLs associated with a network destination. *See*, abstract, col. 8, lines 11-22. Each bookmark URL can be divided into a number of items based on the presence of a "/" or a "." within each URL. Each item is then assigned a number and the items are used to discriminate between bookmarks. *See* abstract, col. 4 lines 42-56, FIGS. 21A-21D. Nakamura does not disclose or suggest a bookmark media object located in the external network environment nor does Nakamura disclose or suggest a bookmark media object that provides information regarding a state of the destination. Because neither Himmel nor Nakamura disclose or suggest bookmark media objects located in the external network environment and that provide information regarding a state of the destination, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-12, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 was rejected by the Examiner as unpatentable over Himmel in view of Nakamura. As amended, claim 13 recites "updating each bookmark media object as a function of a state of the corresponding network destination." Neither Himmel nor Nakamura disclose or suggest updating a bookmark media object as a function of a state of the corresponding network

destination. The Examiner contends that col. 6, lines 23-25 of Himmel disclose updating a bookmark media object. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 6, lines 23-25 describe setting one bookmark set as an active bookmark set to be used by a client browser. Himmel does not disclose or suggest updating a bookmark media object as a function of a state of the corresponding network destination. For at least the foregoing reasons, as well as the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 13, as well as claims 14-21, which depend from claim 13, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 was rejected by the Examiner as unpatentable over Himmel in view of Nakamura. As amended, claim 22 recites “each destination having an associated bookmark media object located in the external network environment, the associated bookmark media object when presented to a user providing information regarding a state of the destination.” For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 22, as well as claims 23-30, which depend from claim 22, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 31 was rejected by the Examiner as unpatentable over Himmel in view of Nakamura. As amended, claim 31 recites that “each bookmark media object when presented to a user provides information regarding a state of a destination within a network environment.” As explained above in reference to claim 13, neither Himmel nor Nakamura disclose or suggest any kind of bookmark that provides information regarding a state of a destination. For at least the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, claim 31, as well as claims 32-38, which depend from claim 31, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 was rejected by the Examiner as unpatentable over Himmel in view of Nakamura. Claim 7 recites that “presenting the bookmark media objects comprises displaying a matrix of bookmark media objects.” Himmel and Nakamura do not disclose or suggest displaying a matrix of bookmark media objects. The Examiner contends that col. 1, lines 50-53 of Himmel discloses displaying a matrix of bookmark media objects. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 1, lines 50-53 simply describes the translation of a URL from a textual address to an IP address. Himmel does not disclose or suggest displaying a matrix of bookmark media

objects. For at least the foregoing reasons, as well as the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 was rejected by the Examiner as unpatentable over Himmel in view of Nakamura. Claim 8 recites “wherein presenting the bookmark media object comprises displaying a stream of video.” The Examiner contends that col. 1, lines 30-40 of Himmel discloses presenting a bookmark media object comprising displaying a stream of video. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Col. 1, lines 30-40 describes “the Web” as a system for retrieving or transferring data files which can include video files. Himmel does not disclose or suggest presenting any kind of bookmark to a user as a stream of video. For at least the foregoing reasons, as well as the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

New Claims

New claims 39-46 have been added. Dependent claim 39 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least that reason. Independent claim 41 is a computer program product claim corresponding to claim 13. For at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to claim 13, claim 41 is allowable. Dependent claims 42-46 are computer program product claims corresponding to claims 14 and 16-20. For at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to claim 41, claims 42-46 are allowable.

Interview Summary of February 20, 2004

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an Interview conducted September 10, 2003. In the interview, in which Applicant's representative Brian J. Gustafson and Examiners Tran and Shah participated, no agreement was reached. Claim 1 was discussed along with the cited references of Himmel and Nakamura. Applicant's representative described the invention and the differences from the cited prior art. The Examiners described the basis for their rejection of claim 1.

Applicant : Michael Kaplan et al.
Serial No. : 09/594,054
Filed : June 14, 2000
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-427001 / P391

Applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed. Enclosed is a \$230 check for excess claim fees. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8 March, 2004



Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 21876
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071